

Remarks

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the review of the present application.

In the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 14-23 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 21 and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6-10 and 14-20 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office actions states that claim 1 recites the limitation “the water generation device” in line 5 for which there is insufficient antecedent basis in the claims. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 by deleting the word “generation” and inserting the word “purification”. Applicants believe that this rejection is now moot and respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-10 and 14-20 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

The Office action rejects claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17 and 21-23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,973,481 issued to Thompson et al. (“Thompson”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220717 issued to Underwood et al. (“Underwood”). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants wish to direct the Examiner’s attention to the amendments made to claims 1, 21 and 23. No new matter has been added. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the specification as filed, for example, on page 3, line 29 through page 4, line10.

With respect to independent claims 1, 21 and 23, the Office action states that Thompson fails to disclose wherein the generation device is a water purifier and monitoring a flow sensor from the source water. See Office action dated July 17, 2009, page 6. As the term “monitoring a flow sensor from the source water” does not appear in the Applicants’ claims, Applicants respectfully presume the Office action is referring to “an input sensor for measuring source water

entering the water purification device” as required by claim 1; “coupling an input sensor for measuring source water entering the water purification device” as required by claim 21; and “input sensors for measuring source water entering the at least one water purification device” as required by claim 23. Applicants request the Examiner provide additional information regarding the term “monitoring a flow sensor from the source water” if Applicants’ presumption is incorrect.

The Office action states that Underwood teaches wherein the generation device is a water purifier and monitoring a flow sensor for the source water. See Office action dated July 17, 2009, page 7. The Office action further states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was created to include the teachings of Underwood into the system and methods as disclosed by Thompson. The Office action further states that the motivation to combine is using a remote SCADA system a user can control the quality of a utility, such as water, by taking the appropriate action to successfully perform processes based on prompts from the control system. See Office action date July 17, 2009, page 8. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Although Applicants do not agree that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was created to include the teachings of Underwood into the system and methods as disclosed by Thompson, even if these references were combined, as the Office action suggests, the result would not include all of the elements required by claims 1, 21 and 23.

Specifically, combining Thompson and Underwood, as suggested in the Office action, does not result in a system including at least an input sensor for measuring source water entering the water purification device as required in various forms by claims 1, 21 and 23.

The Office action states that Underwood teaches monitoring a flow sensor for the source water (abstract, [0024]). See Office action dated July 17, 2009, page 7. However, Underwood teaches an “influent valve 202”. As stated by Underwood, the “influent valve 202 controls the flow of water from the water source to the filter bed 206”. See Underwood, page 2, paragraph [0024]. An influent valve is not an input sensor for measuring source water entering the water purification device as required by claim 1. Rather, Underwood’s influent valve controls the flow of water. Nowhere does Underwood disclose, teach or suggest the influent valve measuring source water entering the water purification device.

Combining Underwood's teachings with those of Thompson would yield a system including an influent valve. The resulting system would not include an input sensor for measuring source water entering the water purification device as required by claims 1, 21 and 23. As stated by the Office action, amongst other elements, Thompson fails to disclose this element. As discussed above, even when Thompson is combined, as the Office action suggests, with Underwood, the combination still fails to disclose an input sensor for measuring source water entering the water purification device. For these reasons and others, claims 1, 21 and 23 are patentable over Thompson in view of Underwood.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants have shown that Thompson in view of Underwood fail to disclose all of the elements claimed in claims 1, 21 and 23 and therefore Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Thompson in view of Underwood. Applicants additionally request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 6-10, 14-20 and 22 as these claims depend from a base claim which has been shown to be allowable.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons all of the claims of the present invention are patentable over the art of record. It is believed that all of the claim rejections have been addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested. If any matter arises which may expedite issuance of a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned, at the telephone number given below.

Applicants believe that a one-month extension of time is required and hereby petition for a one-month extension of time. Applicants request that the associated extension fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383. Applicants also request that any other fee required for timely consideration of this application be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383.

Date: November 17, 2009

Respectfully Submitted,

/Michelle Saquet Temple/

Michelle Saquet Temple
Registration No. 48,834
Attorney for Applicants

DEKA Research & Development Corp.
340 Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101-1129
Tel: (603) 669-5139
Fax: (603) 624-0573